

# Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Face-to-Face meeting 13<sup>th</sup> June 2005

## ***Roll Call***

The roll call is kept on the TC web site under the meeting record.

See [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrif/event.php?event\\_id=7738](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrif/event.php?event_id=7738)

## ***Confirm minute taker***

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

## ***Approve of minutes of May 16<sup>th</sup> Face-to-Face***

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13043>

There were comments and no objections

## ***Call for AOB***

(DaveS) We need 10 mins at the end to talk about the membership process.

(IanR) Yes.

## ***Action Review***

(Editors) Produce PR versions of specs.

(SamM) Basefaults still outstanding – will be done sometime this week.

**Actions:** (Sam) to post PR version Basefaults

(Ian) Contact OASIS to start review. **Done**

(DaveS) If we get this done we should be in good time to get public comments by the next face-to-face.

(TomM) Distribute updated RMD spec **Done**

(Tim) Iterate Primer following 6 June discussion. **See below.**

(Steve G) Raise new issue for further relaxation of RPDoc constraints. (SteveG) the issues is to remove constraints on the RP documents, broadening to ‘Legacy xsd’.

(SteveG) The issue is whether we can simplify the constraints on RP Documents so that we can incorporate legacy xml documents. I need to review and post something. **Carry fwd.**

## ***New issues to consider - Chair***

wsrf-rp review comments - typos in WSRF-RP

(IanR) Hideharu found these: I posted them to the list: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00017.html>

(DaveS) These are already fixed aren't they?

(SteveG) Yes.

(DaveS) There is one potential new issue:

### **Modeling Potential Service Groups**

(DaveS) This resulted from last week's discussion of the Primer example and how print jobs should be modeled. The entire thread is here: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00013.html>

(TimB) The discussion last week proposed four ways to update provide updated access to repeated child elements in an RP document, eg of jobs in a print queue, where the status of one of the jobs is to be changed.

- Use explicit id. Eg use a 'cancelJob' operation on the printer which explicitly quotes the id. This is against the grain of WSRF.
- Use the existing mechanisms and replace the whole collection with a updateResourceProperties. This becomes hard if the collection is large.
- As a Servicegroup with jobs as member Services an abstract of the Job in the ServiceGroup Entry. This seems unnatural.
- As a Servicegroup with null ServiceGroup Entry, and all information in the MemberService. This also seems unnatural.

The issue is whether we need a new mechanism to manage collections of by-value child elements.

(DaveS) This would be more sophisticated than the current method of updating the whole collection, so we would subset the collection. Did we have anything like this in OGSi days?

(SteveG) No. What we have reflects we had for ServiceData.

(DaveS) This starts to get to a more complicated vision in which properties have several distinguishing characteristics; they have their name and some other attribute which allows them to be distinguished from each other when performing an update. Would this be an extension to ResourceProperties, or can we do this with ServiceGroups?

(TimB) I don't think Sg is the right way. We could leave it to the application to define each Child element as a WS-Resource. In effect a simplification of ServiceGroup which allows a null member service. I'm not sure whether we should make this change to SG.

(DaveS) This would be where the Entry holds all the information, and the EntryEPR would allow manipulation, but without a memberService beyond it. Would the lifetime operations be usable?

(TimB) The Entry is a WS-Resource, so we shouldn't make a special restriction.

(IanR) In the case of Print Job, canceling a printJob would be affected by sending Destroy message.

(TimB) Yes – you could use Destroy as the cancel.

(IanR) Dave, when you said 'Entry', was that in the context of SG?

(DaveS) This would allow a SG Entry to not contain a pointer to the memberService. Yes?

(TimB) Yes.

(DaveS) so in some ways it's a very simple change to the SG spec, but with enormous semantic implications because the member may not exist as a separately addressable entity.

(TimB) So there are two proposals: leave it to the applications to model child elements as WS-Resource when they are too numerous for UpdateResourceProperties, or make the memberServiceEPR in SG optional.

(DaveS) Is the pointer required at the moment?

(TomM) I need to look, but perhaps we can relax this, if we said the collection is unconstrained wrt interfaces of member EPRs.

(DaveS) Yes, we don't want to not support interfaces because the EPR is null.

(TimB) So we wouldn't have a membershipContentRule?

(TomM) The rule can also describe Content.

(DaveS) But these aren't required to be resourceProperties, it could be other content. Which seems appropriate. If there are no objections, I would say this is a new issue.

(IanR) Can we restate what the issue is?

(Umit) Yes, please!

(TimB) It's about a more appropriate way to manage WS Resource with repeated child elements which need to be updated.

(DaveS) The shopping cart with a list of items is the simplest example, where I need to change one item, but currently we need to change all of them.

(IanR) That has always been so.

(DaveS) Indeed, if we were only to use ResourceProperties to do it. Another way to do it is to model the items as a collection of member Services in a SG. This seems a bit heavyweight. So this idea is proposing to open a middle ground in between so that we can talk about a member of a collection, in this case a serviceGroup entry, but without the member Service.

(IanR) The SG entry has exactly one associated member, and the proposal is to have a cardinality of zero or one.

(DaveS) There are semantic changes associated with that.

(IanR) So if the SG Entry had no member, it could still have content.

(Umit) What is the requirement for content if there is no member service?

(TomM) The content is derived from the SG implementation, or derived from the Add. It might or might not come from the member service. Also we added an optional RP document sub-element which means the content is a cache copy of the RP document of the member.

(DaveS) That's optional, yes?

(TomM) Right, and that would be precluded by this suggestion.

(Umit) Right.

(William) Why? You could have a member that's not reachable.

(TomM) I don't think we can talk about that normatively.

(Umit) I agree, we don't know what it would be referring to.

(TomM) We could still have it..

(DaveS) But without a member EPR we can't cache the document.

(William) Yes, we could. It could be something that isn't obvious, but it could be done internally, without the EPR, and still be part of the semantics of the data.

(DaveS) So, that's enough discussion to make it an issue. It would be for a revision after the public comment period. We can raise it internally, or make it public which would make it quicker to turn around.

(TomR) Either way works, as long as we publish a document with resolutions including internal and external comments.

(IanR) I don't see why we need to change the process we've got.

(DaveS) Ok, so we need a detailed change list with the revised text. Tim should raise an issue.

(IanR) Can we resummarise the issue one more time?

(Tim) I think it's that we need a way to deal with update of a by-value collection.

(IanR) Absolutely, but we have this already via SetResourceProperties and UpdateResourceProperties.

(William) We could describe it as making the memberServiceEPR optional.

(TimB) This points to a resolution which is Ok with me.

(DaveS) We need more information to justify this, to say that update individually or by subset is required, compared to updating all.

(IanR) Well, this is either an issue with ResourceProperties, or with ServiceGroup.

(William) I think it's with SG because there may be additional use cases that we want to consider.

(SteveG) Yes, I think it's with SG. We also need to consider the implication on Membership control.

(TimB) So the issue is on SG and whether we make the Member ServiceEPR optional.

(DaveS) I think we should describe it as a gap in the capabilities of the whole WSRF framework. The proposed resolution of which is a change to SG, because we might find another resolution.

**Action:** (Tim) Post description to the list.

**Action:** (Bryan) Raise this as an open issue.

(TomR) We could have these new issues in a different document, so that voters can vote on the resolution of issues raised during the review.

(IanR) My preference would be to carry on managing internal issues as they are at the moment, then merge their descriptions and resolutions with public review issues at the end.

(DaveS) Yes, we may discover issues that don't need to be included. We'll manage internal issues as normal and create a new 'changes' document at the end of the review period.

(TomR) Or we could make a public comment when we've made a decision within the TC.

(DaveS) I think we've concluded we don't mind doing the merge at the end because we might not want to include all resolutions made by the TC.

No Objections.

### ***Final comments before we start Public Review?***

(DaveS) Here's the list of the ones that have already been dealt with:

From Ian:

-Line 707, 1632, 1634, 1638

It seems to me that "QueryResourceProperty" should be "QueryResourceProperties" instead.

-Line 1385

I found "DeletResourceProperty". It should be "DeleteResourceProperty" (or "DeleteResourceProperties" ?).

-Line 1632

"ResourceChangePropertyValueNotification" is wrong topic name. The correct one is "ResourcePropertyValueChangeNotification".

(DaveS) Are there any other comments

(TomR) But we voted already, yes?

(IanR) Right, we should just go with the documents we voted on.

(IanR) Anyone who has comments should continue to feed them into the TC.

(DaveS) Ok. Right.

### ***Review either/both updated RMD - Tom***

(TomM) I'm going to be making changes, and need some guidance. We need to put in some advice about cut/copy/paste, but it should be in the AppNotes, right?

(IanR) Right, so we need a new issue to describe the equivalent for metadata.

**Action:** (TomM) Raise new issue.

(TomM) Also, we have a 'definitions' component which gives a targetnamespace. I'm not sure if we still need this. Also multiple metadata descriptors allow collection of info about multiple services. I think we should carry this forward. All that's left in a metadata descriptor is multiple property elements.

Do we need extensibility in metadata component, and if not, is the component useful?

(DaveS) It sounds as though there are enough pieces to go into that section.

(TomM) It seems like metadata exchange could be a useful idea, and to restrict ourselves to property metadata and allow others to deal with operations if they want to. The metadata descriptor is a container for resource properties. Should it be focused on RP, or more generic?

(DaveS) I would like what we do to play well with other proposals that are in progress. I don't want to make a general framework.

(TomM) I'll open an issue and make some suggestions in which case we don't need extensibility. Or do we?

(SteveG) Extensibility is the fashion, but it doesn't work well with jaxrpc.

(DaveS) So this should be an issue, too.

**Action:** (TomM) Raise new issue to discuss the name of the metadata container and extensibility capability.

**Action:** (Bryan) Move this issue to open.

(TomM) We also need to say something about overlapping descriptors in the metadata components. Each of these things needs to be addressable via qname, which means having GED. I suggest we drop all the pathing and just have a Qname reference and have open attribute content.

(DaveS) So this is another issue.

**Action:** (TomM/Bryan) Write issue proposal for metadata descriptors to refer to GED and have open attribute content. (Move to open)

(DaveS) Can we get an updated document by the next call?

(TomM) I can put up a document with proposed resolutions.

**Action:** (TomM) Post updated spec.

### ***Issue review - Chair***

(DaveS) There is no time for this.

### ***AOB: Membership process***

(IanR) The OASIS administration published TC process guidelines. The membership status have been changed. Before we had observer and member, now we have observer, member and voting member. Anyone can be an Observer without being constrained by IPR considerations, and can't contribute (KAVI will be made to prevent this). We have a lot of Observers who which to contribute and whose organizations have signed the IPR agreements, and we need to convert these to non-voting members. We intend to contact the organizational member for all signed-up organizations and ask them if they want members to be converted. We will seek OASIS assistance to allow the other members to contribute until the new rules are implemented at the end of the year.

(SteveG) Does this affect our ability to be quorate.

(DaveS) No. This only affects Observers/non-voting members.

(TomR) We need to decide at some stage we need to check our IPR status.

(DaveS) Hopefully the specs will be finished before then.

(TomR) Right, but if the TC still exists, it's status needs to be resolved.

### ***Straggler Roll Call & Close***

Closed 13:00 Eastern time

Next telecon is on June 27<sup>th</sup>.

### ***Summary of actions***

(Sam) To post PR version Basefaults.

(Steve G) Raise new issue for further relaxation of RPDoc constraints. Carried fwd from 6<sup>th</sup> june.

(Tim) Post description of new issue to the list, describing gap in the framework with potential resolution in SG.

(Bryan) Raise this new issue as 'open'

(TomM) Raise new issue to describe the equivalent of cut/copy/paste for metadata.

(TomM) Raise new issue to discuss the name of the metadata container and its extensibility capability beyond RP documents.

(Bryan) Raise this issue as 'open'.

(TomM/Bryan) Write issue proposal for metadata descriptors to refer to GED and have open attribute content. (Move to open)

**Action:** (TomM) Post revised draft of specification.